

REMARKS

Prior to this amendment, claims 1-20 were pending.

In the office action that was mailed December 1, 2006, claims 1-9 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 5,974,238 to Chase. Claims 10-12, 14 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chase* in view of U.S. pre-grant publication 2002/0029214 by Yianilos. Claim 13 was objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim but allowable if it were to be re-written to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, however, claim 13 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1 because the Examiner determined that there is no support in the specification for claim 13.

By this amendment, the independent claims have been amended to traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(a). This amendment also traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claim 13 has been cancelled.

Paraphrased, claim 1 has been amended to claim an apparatus for synchronizing data in a database stored in a mobile communications device, to a network-copy of the data for the mobile device. The apparatus of amended claim 1 includes the “mapper” of original claim 1, however, amended claim 1 adds a “synchronization request generator,” which that receives a map from the mapper and generates a synchronization request using the map.

Claim 1 also recites that the synchronization request generator provides the synchronization request to a “synchronization server.” The synchronization server is claimed to generate a synchronization request that is sent to a mobile node. The synchronization

request is claimed to include within it, a record to be updated in the mobile node. The claim also recites that the record to be updated in the mobile node is identified within the synchronization request by an integer generated from the map.

Importantly, amended claim 1 requires the integer within the synchronization request to identify the record to be changed to both the mobile node and the network part. In other words, the integer within the synchronization request, identifies and means the same thing to both the mobile node and the network part.

Independent claim 15 is a method claim directed to synchronizing the data stored in a mobile node to data stored at a network. As with the amendment to claim 1, claim 15 now recites new steps that include generating a synchronization request that identifies a data record in a mobile node to be updated. An integer in the synchronization request identifies a record to be updated in the mobile node. The integer is generated from a map that is generated by the mapper and it identifies the mobile record to be updated to both the mobile node and to the network. The last step of amended claim 15 recites the step of sending the synchronization request to a mobile node.

Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 15 can be found in paragraphs [0054] through [0066] of the published application, i.e., pre-grant publication number 2005/0176453. No new matter has been added.

As set forth above, claims 1-9 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Chase*. Claims 10-12, 14 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chase* in view of U.S. pre-grant publication 2002/0029214 by Yianilos. Thus, all of the claim rejections rely on the *Chase* reference.

Chase teaches a method of synchronizing data on a mobile computing device to a desktop computer, however, the method of *Chase* uses, among other things, one set of tags to identify data records stored on a desktop computer and a different set of tags to identify corresponding data records stored in a handheld device. The format of the tags used on a desktop computer is defined in the table that appears in column 13 at line 55 whereas the format of the tags used on a handheld device is defined in the table that appears in column 14 at line 25. Column 9, line 31 through column 10, line 50 of *Chase* also makes it clear that the tags that identify records in a desktop are of a different format than tags that identify records on a handheld device. Put another way, according to *Chase*, tags used in a desktop computer to identify records to update are different from tags used in a handheld device to identify records to update.

As stated above, the amended claims recite that the records to be changed in a mobile device are identified by an “integer” generated from a map that is created by a mapper. The integer is also claimed as identifying the same record to *both* the network copy of a database and the mobile node copy of a database. Lastly, the integer is claimed as being obtained by a conversion process carried out on the map created by a mapper.

The map is described in the applicant’s specification as including fields that map fields of the mobile unit’s database to corresponding entries in the network copy of the same database. (See paragraph [0057].) Paragraph [0058] states that XML tags identify fields used

in the databases. Paragraph [0062] states that the synchronization server, converts a normalized XML record to a tag length (TL) encoding. Paragraph [0062] states that the conversion process converts XML tags to “integer-value equivalents.” Paragraph [0063] states that the integer value identifies a particular field within an address book of the mobile node. Paragraph [0066] states that when an encoded packet, i.e., with the integer, is delivered to a mobile node, an address book object is recovered by the mobile node from the packet. Thus, the integer recited in claims 1 and 15 identify the same record to the network part as it does the mobile node.

The tags disclosed in *Chase* are pointers or vectors to table entries and not XML, (See *Chase*, col. 13, line 34-35.). Perhaps more importantly, in *Chase* the tags used in a desktop computer are different from tags used in a handheld device. Even if the tags in *Chase* were construed to be the integers recited in amended claims 1 and 15, the integer/tags used in a desktop computer of *Chase* would not identify that same data as an integer/tag used in a mobile device because *Chase* requires the tags used in a desktop computer to be different from tags used in a mobile device. Thus, *Chase* cannot satisfy the amended claim limitations that require a synchronization request sent to a mobile device to include an “integer” that identifies to both the mobile node and the network, a data record to be changed in the mobile node.

Put another way, using one set of tags in the network part of the applicant’s invention and a different set of tags in a mobile node would render the applicant’s invention inoperative. Thus, *Chase* does not anticipate claims 1 and 15 as they are amended above.

Since the independent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance because of the amendments to claims 1 and 15, claims that depend from claims 1 and 15 are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the amended claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

Robert H. Kelly
Registration No. 33,922

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com